

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 14, 2001

LB 536, 620

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And that would not be for all corn growers in the state. Correct?

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: One minute.

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, it tends to go based on the area of draw; in other words, where they...where the corn comes from, but I would think, because we have...this would help spread out the ethanol plants across the state, that many areas would be...would be helped.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: If a farmer who grows grain is about to go under, would the corn he'd sell to an ethanol plant keep him afloat...

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: Well, in...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: ...in his farming operation?

SENATOR WEHRBEIN: ...in a case-by-case situation, probably not.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Thank you. And I'm not going to proceed further at this point because our time is up.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Schrock, on FA239.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Mr. Lieutenant Governor, members of the Legislature, Senator Landis, an issue came up last week that I'd like to address, and I think you'd be interested in. LB 620, there was concerns that the ethanol plants may or may not take advantage of that, and there was an amendment to take them out of the picture on that. I talked to Al Wenstrand and he does not believe the plants would qualify. And the reason he does not believe they would qualify is because they have to prove that the plants would not have been built, had it not been for LB 620. And then the question of, how much would it have...how much money would it have involved? The two plants in question would have received probably about \$400,000 a piece in the subsidy. So, I think LB 620, as it applies to the plants, the